IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN

TUESDAY, THE 9TH JANUARY 2007 / 19TH PAUSHA 1928

WP(C).No. 895 of 2007(F)

PETITIONER:

N.A.JOY,
NLLANKARA HOUSE, CHEERACHI,
OLLUR, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.G.HARIHARAN
SRI.PRAVEEN.H.

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
THRISSUR, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
THRISSUR.

3. M.S.SHAJI,
MUDOTHOLI HOUSE, MANALUR,
THRISSUR DT.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.A.FAYAZ

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 09/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN, J.

W.P.(C) NO. 895 OF 2007

Dated this the 9th day of January, 2007

J U D G M E N T

According to the petitioner the third respondent was granted with a regular permit. However, the 3rd respondent did not produce current records within four months from the date of issuance of the grant of permit. He has not filed any revision petition. If a revision is not maintainable, for the same reason a petition under Article 226 will not lie because he may not be the aggrieved person. In a full bench decision reported in **Binu Chacko v. RTA, Pathanamthitta (2006(2) KLT 172)**, it has been held that it cannot be said that in every case where a grant is made in favour of a party, the rival claimant has no right as such. There may be cases where substantial grievance could be shown in which a revision may be maintainable. It is for the petitioner to approach the revisional authority in case he is able to establish that he has got a right of revision as stated in the full bench decision. Writ petition at this stage is dismissed.

Writ petition is dismissed.

P.R.RAMAN, JUDGE

Rp